

REMARKS

Claim Status

No amendments were made in this reply.

5

Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 2-4, 23-35, 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by “The Event Heap: A coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces”, by Johanson.

10

Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 11, 12, 36, 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over “The Event Heap: An enabling Infrastructure for Interactive Workspace”, by Johanson et al. in view of Office Notice.

15

Claims 2-4, 23-35, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bent et al (US 6,901,441) in view of Lehman et al (US 5,974,420) in further view of Johanson et al (“Tuplespaces as Coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces”).

20

Claims 11, 12, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bent et al (US 6,901,441) in view of Lehman et al (US 5,974,420) in further view of Johanson et al (“Tuplespaces as Coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces”) in further view of “The Event Heap: An enabling Infrastructure for Interactive Workspace”, by Johanson et al. in further view of Office Notice.

In reply to the rejections, the Applicant submits the following arguments:

1. With reference to the 102 rejection, the reference “The Event Heap: A coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces”, by Johanson is not prior art for several reasons.
 - a. The reference was published on 6/2002, which is within one year from the priority date of the subject application, which is 4/8/2003.
 - b. The reference does not teach that “each of the unordered named fields of each of said events comprises a post value and a template value” as recited in e.g. claim element 23(b). A further explanation of what this means and how it differs between the current invention and the reference is described below.
 - c. In view of the above reason, 1(b), the public use of the the invention is incorrect since it was not the invention as currently claimed that was tested at that time. In particular, the software that was tested internally at Stanford lacked the use of template and post values (e.g. claim element 23(b)).
2. With reference to the 103 rejection, the reference “The Event Heap: An enabling Infrastructure for Interactive Workspace”, by Johanson et al. also does not teach “that each of the unordered named fields of each of said events comprises a post value and a template value” as recited in claim element 23(b). A further explanation of what this means and how it differs between the current invention and the reference is described below.

To explain the use of two fields values (post value and template value) in the current invention, the Applicant submits the following example.

5 In a traditional tuple space system, an event (usually known as a tuple in traditional systems) is a collection of fields whereby each field has a type, *a value*, and, in some implementations a name. In these traditional systems, *the meaning of the value is determined by how the event is used*. For example, if you post the event, the value represents the information being sent out to other applications. If you use the event as a
10 template, the value represents what you desire to match in events that were posted by other applications. In the first example, you usually are setting an explicit value (e.g. int temperature=76), but in the second example you usually want to set the value to FORMAL (or wildcard) so that you will match posted/sent events that have any value at all in that field.

15

The current invention as claimed is in contrast to the prior approaches, which includes the cited Johanson papers that are used in the 102 and 103 art rejections. In particular, while events still have a set of fields, each field now has a type, name, *post-value and template-value*. In other words, *each field contains two values instead of the one value present in*
20 *traditional systems*. When sending an event, the post-values of the fields are the only ones of significance and the template-values are only present as supplemental information. When using an event as a template, only the template-values of the fields are used in determining which events to retrieve (and the template-values are compared against the post-values in the events that were sent out to determine matches). The

significance of having two values is that it allows an event to fully specify the best value for use in the field for both the case of posting/sending information and the case of using the event as a template to retrieve events sent by others.

5 In addition to the previously indicated support in the specification for the present claims (see previous reply), another section of the specification where post-values and template-values are clearly used is the specification of the event matching algorithm is on page 41, lines 4 - 16.

10 For at least these reasons, Applicant maintains that claims 23 and 29 should be allowable over the cited references as the cited references do not include all elements of claims 23 and 29. Applicant kindly request reconsideration of the claims and submitted arguments in the present and previous reply.

15

CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the rejections in the Office Action and argues why the present claims are different from the art of record. The Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-424-0100 for clarification or any suggested actions such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. Allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Ron Jacobs /

Ron Jacobs
Reg. No. 50,142
Lumen Patent Firm
350 Cambridge Ave., Suite 100
Palo Alto, CA 94306
650-424-0100 (phone)

10